arXiv:1601.06276v1 [math.AP] 23 Jan 2016

A magneto-viscoelasticity problem with a singular memory kernel

Sandra Carillo[1,2], Michel Chipot[3], Vanda Valente[4] and Giorgio Vergara Caffarelli [1]

Abstract

The existence of solutions to a one-dimensional problem arising in magneto-viscoelasticity is here considered. Specifically, a non-linear system of integro-differential equations is analyzed; it is obtained coupling an integro-differential equation modeling the viscoelastic behaviour, in which the kernel represents the relaxation function, with the non-linear partial differential equations modeling the presence of a magnetic field. The case under investigation generalizes a previous study since the relaxation function is allowed to be unbounded at the origin, provided it belongs to L^1; the magnetic model equation adopted, as in the previous results [21, 22, 24, 25] is the penalized Ginzburg-Landau magnetic evolution equation.

1 Introduction

The study of magneto-viscoelastic materials is motivated by the interest on mechanical properties of innovative materials widely studied in a variety of applications. In particular, as far as the coupling between mechanical and magnetic effects is concerned, the interest is motivated by new materials such as Magneto Rheological Elastomers or, in general, magneto-sensitive polymeric composites (see [14, 15] and references therein). A variational approach to study multiscale models, in this context, is given in [8]. The results here presented are connected to a wide research project concerning the analytical study of differential and integro-differential models connected to mechanical properties of materials. Thus, in [24, 25, 29] magneto-elasticitcity problems are considered, in [21, 22] magneto-viscoelasticity problems are studied. Then, in turn, the case of a 1-dimensional, and of a 3-dimensional, body is investigated under the assumption of a regular kernel representing the relaxation modulus. Later, materials with memory characterized by a singular kernel integro-differential equations are studied in [19, 20, 23]. Indeed, as pointed out therein, the case is of interest not only to model different physical behaviours but also under the analytical viewpoint. The interest in *singular kernel* problems goes back to Boltzmann [5] and later, is testified, analytically, by the results of Berti [4], Giorgi and Morro [9], Grasselli and Lorenzi [10] and Hanyga et al. [11, 12, 13]. In addition, *fractional derivative* models, since the works of Rabotnov [17] and Koeller [16], are

[1]

1. Dipartimento *Scienze di Base e Applicate per l'Ingegneria*, Sapienza - Università di Roma, 16, Via A. Scarpa, 00161 Rome, Italy
2. I.N.F.N. - Sezione Roma1, Gr. IV - Mathematical Methods in NonLinear Physics, Rome, Italy
3. Universität Zurich, Institute of Mathematics, Zurich, Switzerland
4. Istituto per le Applicazioni del Calcolo, C.N.R, via dei Taurini 19, 00185 Roma, Italy

employed in [3, 6, 7]. Here, a viscoelastic body is studied under the assumption of a relaxation modulus, modeled by a L^1 function, coupled with a magnetic field.
The problem to study is concerned with the behaviour of a viscoelastic body subject also to the presence of a magnetic field. The body is assumed to be one-dimensional. In particular the problem under investigation is motivated by a great interest in the realization of new materials which, on one side couple a viscoelastic behaviour with a magnetic one, see

$$\begin{cases} u_t(t) - \displaystyle\int_0^t G(t-\tau)u_{xx}(\tau)d\tau - u_1 - \int_0^t \frac{\lambda}{2}(\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\mathbf{m})_x d\tau \ = \int_0^t f(\tau)d\tau \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{in } \mathcal{Q} \\ \mathbf{m}_t + \mathbf{m}\dfrac{|\mathbf{m}|^2-1}{\delta} + \lambda\Lambda(\mathbf{m})u_x - \mathbf{m}_{xx} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

together with the initial and boundary conditions

$$u(\cdot,0) = u_0 = 0, \ \ \mathbf{m}(\cdot,0) = \mathbf{m}_0, \quad |\mathbf{m}_0| = 1 \quad \text{in } \Omega\,, \tag{1.2}$$

$$u = 0, \qquad \frac{\partial \mathbf{m}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\nu}} = 0 \qquad \text{on} \quad \Sigma = \partial\Omega \times (0,T)\,, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\Omega = (0,1)$, $\mathcal{Q} := \Omega \times (0,T)$ and $\mathcal{M} \equiv (0, \mathbf{m})$, letting $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, m_2)$, is the magnetization vector, orthogonal to the conductor so that, since $\mathbf{u} \equiv (u, 0, 0)$, when both quantities are written in $\mathbb{R}^3$; in addition, $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is the outer unit normal at the boundary $\partial\Omega$, Λ is a linear operator defined by $\Lambda(\mathbf{m}) = (m_2, m_1)$, the scalar function u is the displacement in the direction of the conductor itself, here identified with the $x-$axis and λ is a positive parameter. In addition, the term f represents an external force which also includes the deformation history. Moreover we assume:

$$u_1 \in L^2(\Omega), \quad \mathbf{m}_0 \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega), \quad f \in L^2(\mathcal{Q}). \tag{1.4}$$

The model adopted here to describe the magneto-elastic interaction is introduced in [28], [24], [25], [29] and the case of magneto-viscoelastic regular behaviour is given in [21, 22].
In fact, the kernel in the linear integro-differential equation, which represents the relaxation function G, is assumed here to satisfy weaker functional requirements with respect to the *classical* regularity requirements. In particular, the relaxation function $G(t)$ is assumed to be such that

$$G \in L^1(0,T) \cap C^2(0,T), \ \ \forall T \in \mathbb{R}^+ \ ; \tag{1.5}$$

the relaxation function $G(t)$ is assumed to satisfy the further requirements, which follow from the physics of the model,

$$G(t) > 0, \qquad \dot{G}(t) \le 0, \qquad \ddot{G}(t) \ge 0, \qquad t \in (0,\infty). \tag{1.6}$$

Note that, in the *classical* model the relaxation function, further to satisfy conditions (1.6), is assumed to be $C^2[0,T]$, $\forall T \in \mathbb{R}^+$. To this aim, in the following Section 2, a suitable sequence of approximated classical problems is constructed. In the same Section also some apriori estimates are obtained. Crucial in our analysis is the assuption $u_0 = 0$.
The subsequent Section 3, is devoted to prove the existence of a weak solution to the problem (1.1) with the initital and boundary conditions (1.2) - (1.3).

2 Approximated problems and a priori estimates

In this Section, the approximation strategy is devised and, then, some estimates which are needed to prove the existence results are given.
First of all, observe that, the reason why equation $(1.1)_1$ is written under the form of an evolution equation is that the *classical* model [26, 27] is not defined since it depends on $G(0)$ and on the integral of $\dot{G}$ which is not assumed to be in L^1 at the origin. However, in our case, even if the the kernel G of the integral equation is singular at the origin, the regularity requirements it is supposed to satisfy (Cf. (1.5)), guarantee that the *classical* problem can be adopted to model the magneto-viscoelastic behaviour of the material as soon as we consider a time $t > 0$. Hence, here a sequence of *time-translated* approximated problems is constructed. Specifically, let ε denote a *small parameter* $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ and consider an approximated problem corresponding to each value of the parameter ε defined via a ε time translation, that is, let us introduce, corresponding to each $\varepsilon > 0$, the *translated relaxation function* $G^\varepsilon(\cdot) := G(\varepsilon + \cdot)$. Furthermore, it is coupled with a penalized version of the magnetization equation with *penalization parameter* $0 < \delta \ll 1$, i.e. adopting the same model in [21] where, now, the magnetization problem is coupled with a translated viscoelasticity equation. Then, we can introduce the problem P^ε given by :

$$\begin{cases} u^\varepsilon_{tt} - G^\varepsilon(0)u^\varepsilon_{xx} - \displaystyle\int_0^t \dot{G}^\varepsilon(t-\tau)u^\varepsilon_{xx}(\tau)d\tau - \frac{\lambda}{2}(\Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)\cdot\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)_x = f \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{in } \mathcal{Q} \\ \mathbf{m}^\varepsilon_t + \mathbf{m}^\varepsilon\dfrac{|\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon|^2-1}{\delta} + \lambda\Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)u^\varepsilon_x - \mathbf{m}^\varepsilon_{xx} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

together with the initial and boundary conditions

$$u^\varepsilon(\cdot,0) = u_0 = 0,\ \ u^\varepsilon_t(\cdot,0) = u_1, \quad \mathbf{m}^\varepsilon(\cdot,0) = \mathbf{m}_0, \quad \text{in } \Omega\,, \tag{2.8}$$

$$u^\varepsilon = 0, \qquad \frac{\partial \mathbf{m}^\varepsilon}{\partial \boldsymbol{\nu}} = 0 \qquad \text{on} \quad \Sigma = \partial\Omega\times(0,T)\,, \tag{2.9}$$

where $G^\varepsilon(t) \in C^2[0,T]$ and, hence, the non-linear integro-differential problem P^ε is well defined. Specifically, according to [21], such a problem admits a *unique strong solution.*

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\bar{u}$ denote a solution to the problem*

$$\bar{u}_{tt} - G^\varepsilon(0)\bar{u}_{xx} - \int_0^t \dot{G}^\varepsilon(t-\tau)\bar{u}_{xx}(\tau)d\tau = F \ \textit{in}\ \mathcal{Q}, \tag{2.10}$$

where in the r.h.s. $F \in L^2(\mathcal{Q})$. The initial and boundary conditions, in turn, are

$$\bar{u}(\cdot,0) = u_0 = 0,\ \ \bar{u}_t(\cdot,0) = u_1, \qquad \text{in } \Omega \tag{2.11}$$

$$\bar{u} = 0, \qquad\qquad \text{on} \quad \Sigma = \partial\Omega\times(0,T)\,, \tag{2.12}$$

it follows

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega G(t+\varepsilon)\,|\bar{u}_x|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\bar{u}_t|^2\,dx \le \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_1|^2\,dxds + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega G(\varepsilon)\,|u_x(0)|^2 + \tag{2.13}$$

$$+ \int_\Omega\int_0^t F\,\bar{u}_t\,dx\,ds\ .$$

Proof. Here, for the reader convenience, we give the proof which follows the original one by Dafermos [26, 27]. First of all, equation (2.10), when we change the integration variable τ into $s = t - \tau$ add and subtract the term

$$\int_0^t \dot{G}^\varepsilon(s) u_{xx}(t) ds = \left[G^\varepsilon(t) - G^\varepsilon(0)\right] u_{xx}(t) \ ,$$

can be written in the following equivalent form

$$\bar{u}_{tt} - G(t+\varepsilon)\bar{u}_{xx} + \int_0^t \dot{G}(s+\varepsilon)\left[\bar{u}_{xx}(t) - \bar{u}_{xx}(t-s)\right] ds = F. \tag{2.14}$$

Then multiplication of equation (2.14) by $\bar{u}_t$, and integration over Ω gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega |\bar{u}_t|^2 dx \ + \ \int_\Omega G(t+\varepsilon)\bar{u}_x\, \bar{u}_{xt} dx + \\ &+ \int_\Omega \bar{u}_t(t)\, dx \int_0^t \dot{G}(s+\varepsilon)\ \left[\bar{u}_{xx}(t) - \bar{u}_{xx}(t-s)\right] ds = \int_\Omega F\bar{u}_t\, dx \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

that is, since $\bar{u}_t$ is independent of s

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega |\bar{u}_t|^2 dx \ + \ \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega G(t+\varepsilon)|\bar{u}_x|^2\, dx - \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \dot{G}(t+\varepsilon)|\bar{u}_x|^2\, dx - \\ &- \int_\Omega dx \int_0^t \dot{G}(s+\varepsilon)\bar{u}_{xt}\ \left[\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(t-s)\right] ds = \int_\Omega F\bar{u}_t\, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Now, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &-\int_\Omega\int_0^t \dot{G}(s+\varepsilon)\, \bar{u}_{xt}[\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(t-s)]\, dxds \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^t ds \int_\Omega \dot{G}(s+\varepsilon)|\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(t-s)|^2 dx \\ &\qquad +\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \dot{G}(t+\varepsilon)|\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(0)|^2 dx \\ &\quad -\int_\Omega\int_0^t \dot{G}(s+\varepsilon)\bar{u}_{xt}(t-s)[\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(t-s)]\, dxds \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^t ds \int_\Omega \dot{G}(s+\varepsilon)|\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(t-s)|^2 dx \\ &\qquad\qquad +\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \dot{G}(t+\varepsilon)|\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(0)|^2 dx \\ &\quad +\int_\Omega\int_0^t \dot{G}(s+\varepsilon)\frac{d}{ds}\bar{u}_x(t-s)[\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(t-s)]\, dxds \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^t ds \int_\Omega \dot{G}(s+\varepsilon)|\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(t-s)|^2\, dx \\ &\qquad +\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \dot{G}(t+\varepsilon)|\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(0)|^2\, dx \\ &\qquad -\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega\int_0^t \dot{G}(s+\varepsilon)\frac{d}{ds}|\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(t-s)|^2\, dxds \end{aligned}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^t ds \int_\Omega \dot{G}(s+\varepsilon)|\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(t-s)|^2\, dx$$
$$+\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \int_0^t \ddot{G}(s+\varepsilon)|\bar{u}_x(t) - \bar{u}_x(t-s)|^2\, dx\, ds.$$

Substitution of the latter in (2.16), combined with integration over the time interval $(0,t)$, taking into account the sign conditions (1.6), implies (2.13) and, hence, in the case of homogeneous initial displacement condition, completes the proof. □

This last estimate, later on, is combined with the following one.

Lemma 2.2 *Let $(u^\varepsilon, \mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)$ denote a solution to the problem (2.7)–(2.9), then it follows that we have*

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega G^\varepsilon(t)|u_x^\varepsilon|^2\, dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_t^\varepsilon|^2\, dx + \int_0^t \int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_t^\varepsilon|^2\, dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_x^\varepsilon|^2\, dx +$$
$$\frac{\lambda}{2}\int_\Omega \Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)\cdot \mathbf{m}^\varepsilon u_x^\varepsilon\, dx + \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega \frac{(|\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon|^2-1)^2}{\delta}\, dx \leq \tag{2.17}$$
$$\leq \int_0^t \int_\Omega f u_t^\varepsilon dx + +\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_{0,x}|^2\, dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_1|^2\, dx \quad .$$

Proof For sake of simplicity, all the superscripts are omitted. Consider the second equation in (2.7)

$$\mathbf{m}_t + \mathbf{m}\frac{|\mathbf{m}|^2-1}{\delta} + \lambda\Lambda(\mathbf{m})u_x - \mathbf{m}_{xx} = 0. \tag{2.18}$$

Taking the scalar product with $\mathbf{m}_t$, after integration over Ω, it follows

$$\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_t|^2\, dx + \frac{1}{4}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega \frac{\left(|\mathbf{m}|^2-1\right)^2}{\delta}\, dx + \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_x|^2\, dx + \lambda\int_\Omega (\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\mathbf{m}_t)u_x = 0 \tag{2.19}$$

and hence, after integration over $(0,t)$, recall (1.2), i.e. $|\mathbf{m}_0| = 1$,

$$\int_0^t \int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_t|^2\, dx + \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega \frac{\left(|\mathbf{m}|^2-1\right)^2}{\delta}\, dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_x|^2\, dx + \lambda\int_0^t\int_\Omega (\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\mathbf{m}_t)u_x dx = \tag{2.20}$$
$$\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_{0x}|^2\, dx$$

Now, mulplying the first equation in (2.7) by u_t and integrating over Ω, recalling Lemma 2.1, it follows

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega G(t+\varepsilon)\,|u_x|^2\, dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_t|^2\, dx \leq$$

$$\leq \int_\Omega \int_0^t \left[f + \frac{\lambda}{2}(\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\mathbf{m})_x\right] u_t\, dx\, ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega G(\varepsilon)\,|u_x(0)|^2\, dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_1|^2\, dx, \tag{2.21}$$

where, since the initial homogeneous datum ($u_0 = 0$) is assigned, the term where $G(\varepsilon)$ appears cancels. Since

$$(\Lambda(\mathbf{m}) \cdot \mathbf{m}_t) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}(\Lambda(\mathbf{m}) \cdot \mathbf{m}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\Lambda(\mathbf{m}) \cdot \mathbf{m}_x) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dx}(\Lambda(\mathbf{m}) \cdot \mathbf{m}),$$

the combination of (2.20) and (2.21) allows to write

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega G(t+\epsilon)\,|u_x|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_t|^2\,dx + \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_0^t\int_\Omega [(\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\mathbf{m})u_x]_t\,dx + \int_0^t\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_t|^2\,dx \\ + \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega \frac{\left(|\mathbf{m}|^2-1\right)^2}{\delta}\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_x|^2\,dx \quad \le \int_0^t\int_\Omega f u_t\,dx\,ds + \\ + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_{0x}|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_1|^2\,dx\,;\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

which completes the proof. □

The following estimates can then be proved.

Lemma 2.3 *Let $(u^\varepsilon, \mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)$ denote a solution to the problem (2.7)–(2.9), then the following estimates hold*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |u_x^\varepsilon|^2\,dx &\le C_1 \\ \int_\Omega |u_t^\varepsilon|^2\,dx &\le C_2 \\ \int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_x^\varepsilon|^2\,dx &\le C_3 \\ \int_\mathcal{Q} |\mathbf{m}_t^\varepsilon|^2\,dxdt &\le C_4 \\ \int_\Omega \frac{\left(|\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon|^2-1\right)^2}{\delta}\,dx &\le C_5\end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

where $C_k, k = 1,2,3,4,5$, depend on $T, \mathbf{m}_0, f, u_1$, but do not depend on ε nor on δ.

Proof Consider the inequality (2.17) proved in Lemma 2.2, where for simplicity, all the supscripts are omitted and where the initial data are included within the constant $C(\mathbf{m}_0, u_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega G(t+\varepsilon)\,|u_x|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_t|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega \frac{\left(|\mathbf{m}|^2-1\right)^2}{\delta}\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_x|^2\,dx + \\ \int_0^t\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_t|^2\,dx \quad \le -\frac{\lambda}{2}\int_\Omega (\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\mathbf{m})u_x dx + \int_\Omega\int_0^t f u_t\,dx\,ds + C(\mathbf{m}_0, u_1).\end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

Now we have

$$\left|-\frac{\lambda}{2}\int_\Omega (\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\mathbf{m})u_x dx\right| \le \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}|^2|u_x|dx. \tag{2.25}$$

Furthermore, observe that

$$\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}|^2|u_x|dx = \sqrt{\delta}\int_\Omega \frac{\left(|\mathbf{m}|^2-1\right)}{\sqrt{\delta}}|u_x|\,dx + \int_\Omega |u_x|dx \leq \tag{2.26}$$

$$\frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{2}\int_\Omega \frac{\left(|\mathbf{m}|^2-1\right)^2}{\delta}dx + \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{2}\int_\Omega |u_x|^2dx + \frac{\sigma}{2}\int_\Omega |u_x|^2dx + \frac{1}{2\sigma}|\Omega|\ ,$$

where both $\sigma < 1$ and $\delta < 1$. Since $G(t+\varepsilon) > G(T+1), \forall t \in (0,T)$, we can choose σ and δ so that

$$\lambda\sqrt{\delta} < \frac{1}{2}\ , \quad \lambda(\sqrt{\delta}+\sigma) < G(T+1) \tag{2.27}$$

and hence we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega G(t+\varepsilon)|u_x|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_t|^2\,dx + \int_0^t\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_t|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_x|^2\,dx + \tag{2.28}$$

$$+\frac{1}{8}\int_\Omega \frac{(|\mathbf{m}|^2-1)^2}{\delta}\,dx \leq \int_0^t\int_\Omega f u_t dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_{0,x}|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_1|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{2\sigma}|\Omega|\ .$$

Hence, if we set

$$E(t) := \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega G(t)\,|u_x|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u_t|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\mathbf{m}_x|^2\,dx + \frac{1}{8}\int_\Omega \frac{\left(|\mathbf{m}|^2-1\right)^2}{\delta}\,dx\ , \tag{2.29}$$

noting that

$$\left|\int_0^t\int_\Omega f u_t\,dx\,ds\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int_\Omega |u_t|^2\,dx\,ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int_\Omega |f|^2\,dx\,ds\ . \tag{2.30}$$

we obtain

$$E(t) - \int_0^t E(\tau)d\tau\ \leq C(T, \mathbf{m}_0, f, u_1). \tag{2.31}$$

Note, on application of Gronwall's Lemma, it follows that

$$E(t), \int_0^t E(\tau)d\tau \leq \tilde{C}(T, \mathbf{m}_0, f, u_1)\ ,$$

and the proof is completed since all the inequalities (2.23) are implied.

□

3 Existence result for the limit problem

This Section is devoted to prove the existence of weak solutions to the non-linear integro-differential problem (1.1) – (1.3). The key tools are the estimates which are independent of ε. Here the limit when the parameter $\varepsilon \to 0$ is studied. This allows us to establish the existence result in the generalized case of singular kernel, as far as the viscoelastic behaviour is concerned: this result generalizes the previous one in [21].

Theorem 3.1 *For all $T > 0$, there exists a weak solution $(u, \mathbf{m})$ to the problem (1.1)-(1.2)-(1.3), that is a vector function $(u, \mathbf{m})$ s.t.*

- $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H_0^1(\Omega))$;
- $u_t \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$;
- $\mathbf{m} \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$;
- $\mathbf{m}_t \in L^2(\mathcal{Q})$.

which satisfies

$$-\int_{\mathcal{Q}} \phi_t u^\varepsilon(t)dxdt + \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\int_0^t G^\varepsilon(t-\tau)u_x^\varepsilon(\tau)\phi_x d\tau dxdt + \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\int_0^t \frac{\lambda}{2}\Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)\cdot\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon\phi_x d\tau\ dxdt$$

$$-\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\left[u_1 + \int_0^t f(\tau)d\tau\ \right]\phi dxdt + \int_{\mathcal{Q}} \boldsymbol{\psi}_t\cdot\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon dxdt + \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\mathbf{m}_0\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}(\cdot,0)dxdt +$$

$$\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\left(\frac{|\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon|^2-1}{\delta}\right)\boldsymbol{\psi}\cdot\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon dxdt - \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\lambda\, u_x^\varepsilon\,\Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}dxdt - \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\mathbf{m}_x^\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}_x dxdt = 0\ . \tag{3.32}$$

$\forall\phi$ *smooth s.t.* $\phi(0,t) = \phi(1,t) = 0$, $\phi(\cdot,T) = 0$, *and* $\forall\boldsymbol{\psi} \equiv (\psi_1,\psi_2)$ *s.t.* $\boldsymbol{\psi}(x,T) = 0$.

Proof By a weak solution to

$$\begin{aligned} &u_t^\varepsilon(t) - \int_0^t G^\varepsilon(t-\tau)u_{xx}^\varepsilon(\tau)d\tau - u_1 - \int_0^t \frac{\lambda}{2}(\Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)\cdot\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)_x d\tau\ = \int_0^t f(\tau)d\tau \\ &u^\varepsilon(\cdot,0) = u_0 = 0,\quad u^\varepsilon(x,t) = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T) \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

we mean a function $u(x,t)$ such that

$$-\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\phi_t u + \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\int_0^t G(t-\tau)\phi_x u_x(\tau)d\tau + \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\int_0^t\frac{\lambda}{2}(\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\mathbf{m})\phi_x d\tau\ =\ \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\phi\left[u_1 + \int_0^t f(\tau)d\tau\right] \tag{3.34}$$

$\forall\phi$ smooth s.t. $\phi(0,t) = \phi(1,t) = 0$, $\phi(\cdot,T) = 0$, where $\mathcal{Q} = \Omega\times(0,T)$ (we dropped the measure of integration $dxdt$).
By a weak solution to

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{m}_t + \mathbf{m}\frac{|\mathbf{m}|^2-1}{\delta} + \lambda\Lambda(\mathbf{m})u_x - \mathbf{m}_{xx} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{Q} \\ &\mathbf{m}(\cdot,0) = \mathbf{m}_0,\quad \frac{\partial\mathbf{m}}{\partial\boldsymbol{\nu}} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T) \end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

we mean a function $\mathbf{m}\equiv(m_1,m_2)$ such that

$$-\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\boldsymbol{\psi}_t\cdot\mathbf{m} + \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\boldsymbol{\psi}\cdot\mathbf{m}\frac{|\mathbf{m}|^2-1}{\delta} + \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\boldsymbol{\psi}\cdot\lambda\Lambda(\mathbf{m})u_x + \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\boldsymbol{\psi}_x\cdot\mathbf{m}_x - \int_\Omega\mathbf{m}_0\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}(x,0)dx = 0\,. \tag{3.36}$$

$\forall \boldsymbol{\psi}$ s.t. $\boldsymbol{\psi}(x,T)=0$ where $\boldsymbol{\psi}\equiv(\psi_1,\psi_2)$. We start from $(u^\varepsilon,\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} -\displaystyle\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\phi_t u^\varepsilon(t)+\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\int_0^t G^\varepsilon(t-\tau)u_x^\varepsilon(\tau)\phi_x d\tau+\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\int_0^t\frac{\lambda}{2}\Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)\cdot\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon\phi_x d\tau \;= \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \displaystyle\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\left[u_1+\int_0^t f(\tau)d\tau\right]\phi \\ -\displaystyle\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\boldsymbol{\psi}_t\cdot\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon-\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\mathbf{m}_0\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}(\cdot,0)-\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\left(\frac{|\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon|^2-1}{\delta}\right)\boldsymbol{\psi}\cdot\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon+\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\lambda\,u_x^\varepsilon\,\Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}+ \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad +\displaystyle\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\mathbf{m}_x^\varepsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}_x=0\ . \end{cases} \tag{3.37}$$

From the estimates we have

$$u^\varepsilon \qquad \text{is bounded in} \quad L^\infty(0,T;H_0^1(\Omega))\ , \tag{3.38}$$

$$u^\varepsilon(\cdot,t) \qquad \text{is bounded in} \quad H_0^1(\Omega) \quad \text{ifor a.e.} \quad t\in(0,T). \tag{3.39}$$

Then, there exists $u\in L^\infty(0,T;H_0^1(\Omega))$ such that

$$u^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \quad u \ \text{ in } \quad L^\infty(0,T;H_0^1(\Omega)) \ \text{ and also in } L^2(0,T;H_0^1(\Omega)) \tag{3.40}$$

Moreover for a.e. t there exists $v(\cdot,t)\in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$u^\varepsilon(\cdot,t)\rightharpoonup \quad v(\cdot,t) \ \text{ in } \ H_0^1(\Omega),\ u^\varepsilon(\cdot,t)\longrightarrow v(\cdot,t) \ \text{ in } L^2(\Omega)\ . \tag{3.41}$$

We suppose $L^2(0,T;H_0^1(\Omega))$ equipped with the scalar product

$$\int_0^T\int_\Omega u_x v_x dxdt \ \ . \tag{3.42}$$

Let $\varphi\in\mathcal{D}(0,T),\chi\in\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$, from (3.40) we derive

$$\int_0^T\int_\Omega u_x^\varepsilon(\varphi\chi)_x\longrightarrow\int_0^T\int_\Omega u_x(\varphi\chi)_x=\int_0^T\varphi\int_\Omega u_x\chi_x \tag{3.43}$$

One has also for a.e. t by (3.41)

$$\int_\Omega u_x^\varepsilon\chi_x\longrightarrow\int_\Omega v_x\chi_x\ . \tag{3.44}$$

Moreover due to the estimates that we have $u_x^\varepsilon,\int_\Omega u_x^\varepsilon\chi_x$ are uniformly bounded in t and by the Lebesque theorem one derive that

$$\int_0^T\int_\Omega u_x^\varepsilon(\varphi\chi)_x=\int_0^T\varphi\int_\Omega u_x^\varepsilon\chi_x\longrightarrow\int_0^T\varphi\int_\Omega v_x\chi_x\ . \tag{3.45}$$

Comparing (3.43), (3.45) we derive that for a.e. t

$$\int_\Omega u_x^\varepsilon\chi_x=\int_\Omega v_x^\varepsilon\chi_x\ \ \forall\chi\in\mathcal{D}(\Omega)\ . \tag{3.46}$$

This implies that

$$u(\cdot,t)=v(\cdot,t) \qquad \text{a.e.} \ \ t\in(0,T). \tag{3.47}$$

Since $\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon$ is such that

$$\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon \qquad \text{is bounded in} \quad L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega))\ , \tag{3.48}$$

$$\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon(\cdot,t) \qquad \text{is bounded in} \quad H^1(\Omega)\subset C^{1/2}(\bar\Omega) \quad \text{a.e.} \quad t\in(0,T). \tag{3.49}$$

arguing as above one derives the existence of $\mathbf{m}\in L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$ s.t. up to a subsequence

$$\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \quad \mathbf{m} \ \text{ in } \quad L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\Omega))\ , \tag{3.50}$$

$$\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon(\cdot,t)\longrightarrow \mathbf{m}(\cdot,t) \ \text{ in } \ C^0(\bar\Omega), \quad \text{a.e.} \ \ t. \tag{3.51}$$

One can then pass to the limit in (3.37) to get (3.34), (3.36). Let us first derive (3.34).

- From (3.40) $u^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \quad u$ in $L^2(0,T;H^1_0(\Omega))=L^2(\mathcal{Q})$ and thus, when $\varepsilon\to 0$

$$\int_\Omega \phi_t\, u^\varepsilon \longrightarrow \int_\Omega \phi_t\, u\ . \tag{3.52}$$

- Due to our assumptions for t fixed we have when $\varepsilon\to 0$

$$G^\varepsilon(t-\tau)\longrightarrow \quad G(t-\tau) \ \text{ in } \quad L^1(0,t)$$

and by (3.44), (3.47)

$$\int_\Omega \phi_x(x,t)\, u^\varepsilon_x(x,\tau)dx \quad\longrightarrow\quad \int_\Omega \phi_x(x,t)\, u_x(x,\tau)dx \qquad \text{a.e.} \ \ \tau\in(0,t)$$

and these integrals are uniformly bounded independently of ε. It follows that

$$\int_0^t G^\varepsilon(t-\tau)\int_\Omega \phi_x(x,t)\, u^\varepsilon_x(x,\tau)d\tau dx \longrightarrow \int_0^t G(t-\tau)\int_\Omega \phi_x(x,t)\, u_x(x,\tau)d\tau dx\,.$$

Since these integrals are uniformly bounded independently it follows that

$$\int_0\!\!\int_0^T\!\!\int_0^t G^\varepsilon(t-\tau)\int_\Omega \phi_x(x,t)\, u^\varepsilon_x(x,\tau)d\tau dx dt \to \int_0\!\!\int_0^T\!\!\int_0^t G(t-\tau)\int_\Omega \phi_x(x,t)\, u_x(x,\tau)d\tau dx dt$$

i.e.

$$\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\int_0^t G^\varepsilon(t-\tau)\, u^\varepsilon_x\, \phi_x \longrightarrow \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\int_0^t G(t-\tau)\, u_x\, \phi_x\ .$$

- Since $\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon(\cdot,\tau)\to\mathbf{m}(\cdot,\tau)$ in $C^0(\bar\Omega)$ a.e. τ one has

$$\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\int_0^t \frac{\lambda}{2}\Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)\cdot\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon\,\phi_x d\tau \longrightarrow \int_{\mathcal{Q}}\int_0^t \frac{\lambda}{2}\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\mathbf{m}\,\phi_x d\tau$$

which completes the existence of solution to (3.34). To pass to the limit in the second equation in (3.37) due to (3.50)-(3.51) only perhaps the fourth integral is not clear. But from (3.51), (3.41)

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}(\cdot,t)\longrightarrow\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}(\cdot,t) \ \text{ in } \ L^2(\Omega), \qquad \text{a.e.} \ \ t.$$

$$u^\varepsilon_x(\cdot,t)\rightharpoonup \quad u_x(\cdot,t) \quad \text{ in } \quad L^2(\Omega), \qquad \text{a. e.} \quad t.$$

This implies that

$$\int_\Omega \lambda\, u^\varepsilon_x\Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}(\cdot,t)\longrightarrow\int_\Omega\lambda\, u_x\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}(\cdot,t) \qquad \text{a.e.} \ \ t.$$

Since all these integrals are uniformly bounded one deduces that

$$\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\lambda\, u^\varepsilon_x\,\Lambda(\mathbf{m}^\varepsilon)\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}\longrightarrow\int_{\mathcal{Q}}\lambda\, u_x\,\Lambda(\mathbf{m})\cdot\boldsymbol{\psi}$$

which completes the proof of the existence of a solution to (3.36).

□

Acknowledgments

S.Carillo wishes to acknowledge the partial financial support of GNFM-INDAM, INFN and SAPIENZA Università di Roma. The research of M. Chipot leading to these results has received funding from Lithuanian-Swiss cooperation programme to reduce economic and social disparities within the enlarged European Union under project agreement No CH-3-SMM-01/0. M. Chipot thanks also the Italian GNFM-INdAM and SBAI Dept. for the kind hospitality in Rome.

References

[1] G. Gentili, *Regularity and stability for a viscoelastic material with a singular memory kernel*, J. Elasticity, **37**, 2, (1995), 139 – 156.

[2] A. Hanyga, *Wave propagation in media with singular memory*, Math. Comput. Modelling, **34**, 12 – 13, (2001), 1329 – 1421.

[3] K. Adolfsson, M. Enelund and P. Olsson, *On the Fractional Order Model of Viscoelasticity*, Mechanics of Time-Dependent Materials **9**, (2005), 15 – 34.

[4] V. Berti, *Existence and uniqueness for an integral-differential equation with singular kernel*, Boll. Un. Mat. Italiana, Sez. B., **9-B**, 2006, 299 – 309.

[5] Boltzmann, L., *Zur theorie der elastichen nachwirkung*, Annalen der physik und chemie **77**, (1876), 624 – 654.

[6] M. Enelund, L. Mähler, K. Runesson and B.L. Josefson, *Formulation and integration of the standard linear viscoelastic solid with fractional order rate laws*, Int. J. Solids Struc., **36**, (1999), 2417 – 2442.

[7] M. Enelund and P. Olsson, *Damping described by fading memory, Analysis and application to fractional derivative models*, Int. J. Solids Struc. **36**, (1999), 939 – 970.

[8] G.Ethiraj, A.Sridhar and C.Miehe, *Variational modeling and homogenization in dissipative magneto-mechanics*, GAMM-Mitt. **38**, 1, (2015), 75 – 101.

[9] C. Giorgi and A. Morro, *Viscoelastic solids with unbounded relaxation function*, Continuum Mechanics And Thermodynamics, **4**, 2, (1992), 151-165. doi: 10.1007/BF01125696.

[10] M. Grasselli and A. Lorenzi, *Abstract nonlinear Volterra integro-differential equations with nonsmooth kernels*. Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. Rend. Lincei **9**, 1 Mat. Appl. 2 (1991).

[11] A. Hanyga, *Relations between relaxation modulus and creep compliance in anisotropic linear viscoelasticity*, Journal of Elasticity **88**, (2007), 41 – 61. doi: 10.1007/s10659-007-9112-6

[12] A. Hanyga and M. Seredynska, *Relations between relaxation modulus and creep compliance in anisotropic linear viscoelasticity*, Journal of Elasticity **88**, (2007), 41 – 61. doi: 10.1007/s10659-007-9112-6

[13] A. Hanyga and M. Seredynska, *Asymptotic and exact fundamental solutions in hereditary media with singular memory kernels*, Quart. Appl. Math. 60 (2002), **2**, 213 – 244.

[14] M. Hossain, P. Saxena and P. Steinmann, *Modelling the curing process in magneto-sensitive polymers: rate-dependence and shrinkage*, International Journal of Non-Linear Mechanics, **74**, (2015), 108 – 121. ISSN 0020-7462, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnonlinmec.2015.04.008.

[15] M. Hossain, P. Saxena and P. Steinmann, *Modelling the mechanical aspects of the curing process of magneto-sensitive elastomeric materials*, International Journal of Solids and Structures, **58**, (2015), 257 – 269. ISSN 0020-7683, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2015.01.010.

[16] R.C. Koeller, *Applications of fractional calculus to the theory of viscoelasticity*, ASME J. Appl. Mech., **51**, (1984), 299 – 307.

[17] Yu.N. Rabotnov, Elements of Hereditary Solid Mechanics, Mir Publishers, Moscow, 1980.

[18] V. Berti, *Existence and uniqueness for an integro-differential equation with singular kernel* Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat. **8**, 9 (2006), no. 2, 299 – 309.

[19] S. Carillo, V. Valente and G. Vergara Caffarelli *A linear viscoelasticity problem with a singular memory kernel: an existence and uniqueness result* Differential and Integral Equations, **26**, 9/10, (2013), 1115 – 1125.

[20] S. Carillo., V. Valente and Vergara Caffarelli G. *heat conduction with memory: a singular kernel problem.* Evolution Equations and Control Theory, **3**, 3, (2014), 399 – 410. doi:10.3934/eect.2014.399

[21] S. Carillo, V. Valente and G. Vergara Caffarelli, *A result of existence and uniqueness for an integro-differential system in magneto-viscoelasticity*, Applicable Analysis: An International Journal, 1563-504X, First published on 19 August 2010, (2010); **90**, 12, (2011), 1791 – 1802. doi: 10.1080/00036811003735832

[22] S. Carillo, V. Valente and G. Vergara Caffarelli, *An existence theorem for the magneto-viscoelastic problem* Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems Series S., **5**, 3, (2012), 435 – 447. doi:10.3934/dcdss.2012.5.435

[23] S. Carillo, *Singular kernel problems in materials with memory*, Meccanica, **50**, 3, (2015), 603 – 615. doi: 10.1007/s11012-014-0083-y

[24] M. Chipot, I. Shafrir, V. Valente and G. Vergara Caffarelli, *A nonlocal problem arising in the study of magneto-elastic interactions.* Boll. UMI Serie IX, **I**, (2008), 197 – 222.

[25] M. Chipot, I. Shafrir, V. Valente and G. Vergara Caffarelli, *On a hyperbolic-parabolic system arising in magnetoelasticity.* J. Math. Anal. Appl., **352**, (2009), 120 – 131.

[26] C.M. Dafermos, *An abstract Volterra equation with applications to linear viscoelasticity*, J. Diff. Equations, **7**, (1970), 554 – 569.

[27] C.M. Dafermos, *Asymptotic stability in viscoelasticity*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., **37**, (1970), 297 – 308.

[28] S. He, *Modélisation et simulation numérique de matériaux magnétostrictifs*. PhD thesis, UniversitéPierre et Marie Currie, (1999).

[29] V. Valente and G. Vergara Caffarelli, *On the dynamics of magneto-elastic interactions: existence of solutions and limit behavior*, Asymptotic Analysis **51**, (2007), 319 – 333.

[30] S. Zheng, *Nonlinear parabolic equations and hyperbolic-parabolic coupled systems*, Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics 76, Longman, 1995.